Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/616,884	HATCHER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	MICAH-PAUL YOUNG	1618
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):		
(1) <u>MICAH-PAUL YOUNG</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>George Lefkowitz</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 28 December 2007.		
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description:		
Claim(s) discussed: <u>39-44</u> .		
Identification of prior art discussed:		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) $\mathbb{N}$ N/A.		
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued that the new claims 39-44 should be included in the rejection as they are further limiting features of the chosen invention. The new claims describe the gelling component and the biocompatible polymer of the composite. The Examiner agreed and indicated that a supplemental Final Rejection would be forthcoming.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.		
	/Micah-Paul Young/ Examiner, Art Unit 1618 Examiner's signature, if requi	red